arXiv:1604.00113v2 [math.AT] 31 Oct 2016

Tropical Coordinates on the Space of Persistence Barcodes

Sara Kališnik Verovšek

Brown University, sara_kalisnik_verovsek@brown.edu

Abstract

The aim of applied topology is to use and develop topological methods for applied mathematics, science and engineering. One of the main tools is persistent homology, an adaptation of classical homology, which assigns a barcode, i.e. a collection of intervals, to a finite metric space. Because of the nature of the invariant, barcodes are not well-adapted for use by practitioners in machine learning tasks. We can circumvent this problem by assigning numerical quantities to barcodes and these outputs can then be used as input to standard algorithms. It is the purpose of this paper to identify tropical coordinates on the space of barcodes and prove that they are stable with respect to the bottleneck distance and Wasserstein distances.

Keywords: Persistent Homology, Coordinatizing the Barcode Space, Tropical Polynomials.

1 Introduction

In the past two decades, with the emergence of 'big data', topology started playing a prominent role in data analysis [6, 5]. Topological ideas have inspired methods for visualizing complex datasets [24] as well as 'measuring' the shape of data. Using the most famous example of the latter, persistent homology [7], researchers have solved problems in sensor networks [19, 3], medicine [1, 17], neuroscience [10, 20, 13] and gained insights into texture images [22].

The output of persistent homology is a barcode, i.e. a collection of intervals. The unusual structure of the invariant makes the method unaccessible to scientists without substantial knowledge of topological methods. To make it easier to combine with standard algorithms within machine learning, various attempts have been made to assign numerical

quantities to barcodes [23, 8, 15, 16, 4, 2, 9]. For example, Di Fabio and Ferri [15, 16] assign complex vectors to barcodes, Bubenik [4] persistence landspaces.

Adcock et al. [2] chose a different approach and identified an algebra of polynomials on the barcode space that can be used as coordinates. Unfortunately, the functions identified are not stable with respect to the standard distances usually used on the barcode space. This prompted us to search for other types of coordinates on the barcode space. The interpretation of the space of persistence barcodes as embedded in the geometric points of an affine scheme over $\mathbb{R}$ led us to the conclusion that some important functions were not included, notably max and min functions, which suggested to us that it would be valuable to carry out a parallel analysis where tropical functions on the barcodes are studied. This is what we do in this paper.

We represent a barcode with exactly n intervals as a vector $(x_1, d_1, x_2, d_2, , \ldots, x_n, d_n)$, where x_i denotes the left endpoint of the i-th interval and d_i its length. We assume that $x_i \geq 0$ for all i (this is not unreasonable since when constructing simplicial complexes from point clouds, the parameter is radius, which is nonnegative). Since the ordering of the intervals does not matter, we take the orbit space, B'_n, of the action of the symmetric group on n letters on the product $([0, \infty) \times [0, \infty))^n$ given by permuting the coordinates. The barcode space, B', is the quotient

$$\coprod_n B'_n/_\sim,$$

where $\sim$ is generated by equivalences of the form

$$\{(x_1, d_1), (x_2, d_2), \ldots, (x_n, d_n)\} \sim \{(x_1, d_1), (x_2, d_2), \ldots, (x_{n-1}, d_{n-1})\},$$

whenever $d_n = 0$.

We identify subsemirings of symmetric max-plus polynomials and tropical rational functions that respect this equivalence relation, and describe their generators explicitly so that they can be used by researchers interested in analyzing datasets of shapes. We prove that all the functions listed are stable with respect to the bottleneck and Wasserstein distances. In addition, there are enough of them to separate the barcodes. In the last section we demonstrate how these coordinates can be used in practice.

The overview of the paper. In Section 2 we provide the necessary background in tropical algebra. Section 3 reviews the barcode space and the most commonly used distances on the barcode space (bottleneck, Wasserstein distances). In Section 4 we identify max-plus polynomials on the barcode space and prove that they are stable with respect to the bottleneck and Wasserstein distances. Since these functions do not separate the barcodes, we observe a larger semiring of tropical rational functions in Section 6. We find enough functions to separate the barcode space and we prove stability with respect to the bottleneck and Wasserstein distances. In the last section we demonstrate how tropical coordinates can be used to classify digits from the MNIST dataset.

2 Tropical and Arctic Semirings

This section reviews the material that first appeared in Symmetric and r-Symmetric Tropical Polynomials and Rational Functions [25].

2.1 Tropical Functions

Tropical algebra is based on the study of the tropical semiring $(\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}, \oplus, \odot)$. In this semiring, addition and multiplication are defined as follows:

$$a \oplus b := \min(a, b) \quad \text{and} \quad a \odot b := a + b.$$

Both are commutative, associative and distributive.

Related to the tropical semiring, is the arctic semiring $(\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}, \boxplus, \odot)$, where multiplication of two elements is defined as before, but adding means taking their maximum instead of the minimum:

$$a \boxplus b := \max(a, b) \quad \text{and} \quad a \odot b := a + b.$$

Its operations are associative, commutative and distributive as in the tropical semiring.

Let $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$ be variables representing elements in the max-plus semiring. A *max-plus monomial expression* is any product of these variables, where repetition is allowed. By commutativity, we can sort the product and write monomial expressions with the variables raised to exponents.

A *max-plus polynomial expression* is a finite linear combination of max-plus monomial expressions:

$$p(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) = a_1 \odot x_1^{a_1^1} x_2^{a_2^1} \ldots x_n^{a_n^1} \boxplus a_2 \odot x_1^{a_1^2} x_2^{a_2^2} \ldots x_n^{a_n^2} \boxplus \ldots \boxplus a_m \odot x_1^{a_1^m} x_2^{a_2^m} \ldots x_n^{a_n^m},$$

Here the coefficients $a_1, a_2, \ldots a_m$ are real numbers and the exponents a_j^i for $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$ are nonnegative integers.

The *total degree of a max-plus expression* $p(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ is

$$\deg p = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} (a_1^i + a_2^i + \ldots + a_n^i).$$

The passage from max-plus polynomial expressions to functions is not one-to-one. Let p and q be max-plus polynomial expressions. If

$$p(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) = q(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$$

for all $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \in (\mathbb{R} \cup \infty)^n$, then p and q are *functionally equivalent*. We write $p \sim q$.

Definition 2.1. Max-plus polynomials are the semiring of equivalence classes of max-plus polynomial expressions with respect to $\sim$. In the case of n variables we denote the semiring by $\texttt{MaxPlus}[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n]$.

We define min-plus polynomials expression as max-plus with $\boxplus$ replaced by $\oplus$. We define the degree of a min-plus polynomial expression analogously.

Definition 2.2. Min-plus polynomials are the semiring of equivalence classes of min-plus polynomial expressions with respect to functional equivalence relation $\sim$. In the case of n variables we denote the semiring by $\texttt{MinPlus}[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n]$.

It can be shown that degrees of all max-plus (min-plus) expressions in the same equivalence class are the same and that it is therefore possible to define the degree of a max-plus (min-plus) polynomial.

A tropical rational expression r is a quotient

$$r(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = p(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \odot q(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^{-1},$$

where p and q are min-plus polynomial expressions.

Definition 2.3. The semiring of equivalence classes of tropical rational expressions with respect to the functions equivalence relation is $\texttt{RTrop}[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n]$ and is called the *semiring of rational tropical functions.*

Since

$$-\min(a, b) = \max(-a, -b),$$

tropical rational expressions are composed by taking the maxima and minima of linear functions, i.e. the set of tropical rational expressions is the smallest subset of functions $\mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ containing all constant maps and projections that is closed under $+$, min and max.

Conversely, any function from this set can be represented by an expression of the form $p \odot q^{-1}$, where p and q are tropical polynomial expressions. The algorithm to produce p and q is the usual one of adding fractions by finding a common denominator, but performed in tropical arithmetic.

Example 2.4. Let $r(x_1, x_2) = x_1^{-1} \odot x_2 \oplus (x_2)^{-1} \oplus (x_2 \odot x_1 \oplus x_1)^{-1}$. We can write

$$\begin{aligned}
r(x_1, x_2) &= \min(-x_1 + x_2, -x_2, -\min(x_2 + x_1, x_1)) \\
&= \min(-x_1 + x_2 + \min(x_2 + x_1, x_1), -x_2 + \min(x_2 + x_1, x_1), 0) - \min(x_2 + x_1, x_1) \\
&= \min(\min(2x_2, x_2), -x_2 + \min(x_2 + x_1, x_1), 0) - \min(x_2 + x_1, x_1) \\
&= \min(\min(3x_2, 2x_2), \min(x_2 + x_1, x_1), x_2) - \min(2x_2 + x_1, x_2 + x_1) \\
&= \min(3x_2, 2x_2, x_1 + x_2, x_1, x_2) - \min(2x_2 + x_1, x_1 + x_2) \\
&= (x_2^3 \oplus x_1 \oplus x_2) \odot (x_2^2 x_1 \oplus x_1 x_2)^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

This is similar to adding fractions with different denominators.

The functions contained in either $\texttt{MinPlus}[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n]$, $\texttt{MaxPlus}[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n]$ or $\texttt{RTrop}[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n]$ are called *tropical functions*.

2.2 Symmetric Tropical Functions

Definition 2.5. A tropical function f is symmetric if

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = f(x_{\pi(1)}, \ldots, x_{\pi(n)})$$

for every permutation $\pi \in S_n$.

Given variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, we define the *elementary symmetric max-plus polynomials* $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n \in \texttt{MaxPlus}[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n]$ by the formulas

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_1 &= x_1 \boxplus \ldots \boxplus x_n, \\
&\vdots \\
\sigma_k &= \boxplus_{\pi \in S_n} x_{\pi(1)} \odot \ldots \odot x_{\pi(k)}, \\
&\vdots \\
\sigma_n &= x_1 \odot x_2 \odot \ldots \odot x_n.
\end{aligned}$$

The following equivalent of the Fundamental Theorem of Symmetric Polynomials holds.

Theorem 2.6 (Fundamental Theorem of Symmetric Max-Plus Polynomials)**.** *Every symmetric max-plus polynomial in* $\texttt{MaxPlus}[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n]$ *can be written as a max-plus polynomial in the elementary symmetric max-plus polynomials* $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n$.

2.3 2-Symmetric Tropical Functions

A tropical function in n variables is symmetric if it is invariant under the action of S_n that permutes the variables. We can generalize this definition as follows: a tropical function in nr variables, divided into n blocks of r variables each, is r-symmetric if it is invariant under the action of S_n that permutes the blocks while preserving the order of the variables within each block. We state the results for $r = 2$ because persistence barcodes are collections of intervals.

Definition 2.7. A tropical function p is 2-symmetric if

$$p(x_{1,1}, x_{1,2}, \ldots, x_{n,1}, x_{n,2}) = p(x_{\pi(1),1}, x_{\pi(1),2}, \ldots, x_{\pi(n),1}, x_{\pi(n),2})$$

for every permutation $\pi \in S_n$.

Fix n. Let the symmetric group S_n act on the matrix of indeterminates

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} x_{1,1} & x_{1,2} \\ x_{2,1} & x_{2,2} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ x_{n,1} & x_{n,2} \end{pmatrix}$$

by left multiplication. Let

$$\mathscr{E}_n = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} e_{1,1} & e_{1,2} \\ e_{2,1} & e_{2,2} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ e_{n,1} & e_{n,2} \end{pmatrix} \neq [0]_n^2 \mid e_{i,j} \in \{0,1\} \text{ for } i = 1,2,\ldots,n, \text{ and } j = 1,2 \right\}.$$

A matrix $\begin{pmatrix} e_{1,1} & e_{1,2} \\ e_{2,1} & e_{2,2} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ e_{n,1} & e_{n,2} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathscr{E}_n$ determines a max-plus monomial $P(E) = x_{1,1}^{e_{1,1}} x_{1,2}^{e_{1,2}} \ldots x_{n,1}^{e_{n,1}} x_{n,2}^{e_{n,2}}$.
We denote the set of orbits under the row permutation action on $\mathscr{E}_n$ by $\mathscr{E}_n/S_n$. Each orbit $\{E_1, E_2, \ldots E_m\}$ determines a 2-symmetric max-plus polynomial

$$P(E_1) \oplus P(E_2) \oplus \ldots \oplus P(E_m).$$

Definition 2.8. We call the 2-symmetric max-plus polynomials that arise from orbits $\mathscr{E}_n/S_n$ elementary. We let $\sigma_{(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}$ denote the tropical polynomial that arises from the orbit

$$\left[\begin{pmatrix} e_{1,1} & e_{1,2} \\ e_{2,1} & e_{2,2} \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ e_{n,1} & e_{n,2} \end{pmatrix} \right].$$

There are enough 2-symmetric max-plus polynomials to separate the orbits. We will need this piece of information to show that the functions we define in Section 6 separate barcodes.

Proposition 2.9. *Let $\{(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)\}$ and $\{(x'_1, y'_1), \ldots, (x'_n, y'_n)\}$ be two orbits under the row permutation action on $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$. If*

$$\sigma(\{(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)\}) = \sigma(\{x'_1, y'_1), \ldots, (x'_n, y'_n)\})$$

for all elementary 2-symmetric tropical polynomials σ, then

$$\{(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_n, y_n)\} = \{(x'_1, y'_1), \ldots, (x'_n, y'_n)\}.$$

We identified a finite set that generated symmetric max-plus polynomials. No such statement holds in the case of 2-symmetric max-plus polynomials.

Proposition 2.10. $\text{MaxPlus}[x_{1,1}, x_{1,2}, x_{2,1}, x_{2,2}]^{S_2}$ *is not finitely generated.*

3 Persistent Homology

Classical topologists developed homology in order to 'measure' shape. In simplest terms, homology counts the occurrences of patterns, such as the number of connected components, loops and voids. The adaptation of homology to the study of point cloud data sets is called persistent homology [18, 14, 7].

The idea is that the union of discs with radius r centered around points from the data set recovers the underlying shape of the point cloud. We do not know *a priori* how to choose the radius. Persistent homology computes and keeps track of the changes in the homology these unions of discs over a range of radii parameters r. The output is a barcode, i.e.
a collection of intervals. Each interval corresponds to a topological feature which appears at the value of a parameter given by the left hand endpoint of the interval and disappears at the value given by the right hand endpoint. These barcodes play the same role as a histogram would in summarizing the shape of the data — long intervals correspond to strong topological signals and short ones to noise.

3.1 Barcode Space, Bottleneck Distance, Wasserstein Distances

Each barcode with n intervals can be encoded as $(x_1, d_1, x_2, d_2, \ldots, x_n, d_n)$ where x_i is the left endpoint of the i-th interval and d_i its length. Since the ordering of the intervals does not matter, we take the orbit space of the action of the symmetric group on n letters on the product $([0,\infty) \times [0,\infty))^n$ given by permuting the coordinates. We denote it by B'_n.

The barcode space B' is the quotient

$$\coprod_n B'_n/\sim,$$

where $\sim$ is generated by equivalences of the form

$$\{(x_1, d_1), (x_2, d_2), \ldots, (x_n, d_n)\} \sim \{(x_1, d_1), (x_2, d_2), \ldots, (x_{n-1}, d_{n-1})\},$$

whenever $d_n = 0$.

To define distance between two barcodes, we need to specify the distance between any pair of intervals, as well as the distance between any interval and the set of zero length intervals $\Delta = \{(x, x) \mid -\infty < x < \infty\}$. Set

$$\mathrm{d}_\infty((x_1, d_1), (x_2, d_2)) = \max(|x_1 - x_2|, |d_1 - d_2 + x_1 - x_2|).$$

The distance between an interval and the set Δ is

$$\mathrm{d}_\infty((x, d), \Delta) = \frac{d}{2}.$$

Let $\mathscr{B}_1 = \{I_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in A}$ and $\mathscr{B}_2 = \{J_\beta\}_{\beta\in B}$ be barcodes. For finite sets A and B, and any bijection θ from a subset $A' \subseteq A$ to $B' \subseteq B$, the penalty of θ, $P_\infty(\theta)$, is

$$P_\infty(\theta) = \max(\max_{a\in A'}(\mathrm{d}_\infty(I_a, J_{\theta(a)})), \max_{a\in A\setminus A'} \mathrm{d}_\infty(I_a, \Delta), \max_{b\in B\setminus B'} \mathrm{d}_\infty(I_b, \Delta)).$$

The *bottleneck distance* [11] is

$$\mathrm{d}_\infty(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2) = \min_\theta P_\infty(\theta),$$

where the minimum is over all possible bijections from subsets of A to subsets of B.

There are other metrics also commonly used for barcode spaces. Setting the penalty for θ as above to

$$P_p(\theta) = \sum_{a\in A'} \mathrm{d}_\infty(I_a, J_{\theta(a)})^p + \sum_{a\in A\setminus A'} \mathrm{d}_\infty(I_a, \Delta)^p + \sum_{b\in B\setminus B'} \mathrm{d}_\infty(I_b, \Delta)^p$$

yields the pth-Wasserstein distance ($p \geq 1$) between $\mathscr{B}_1$, $\mathscr{B}_2$:

$$\mathrm{d}_p(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2) = (\min_\theta P_p(\theta))^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

4 Max-Plus Polynomials on the Barcode Space

In this section we find all max-plus polynomials that we can use as coordinates on the barcode space and prove that they are stable with respect to the bottleneck and Wasserstein distances.

The first step is to identify max-plus polynomials on the image of $B'_n \to B'$. We denote it by B_n. It can also be obtained from B'_n by taking the quotient of the following equivalence relation: two multisets of n intervals each,

$$I = \{(x_1, d_1), (x_2, d_2), \ldots, (x_n, d_n)\} \text{ and } J = \{(x_1, d_1), (x_2, d_2), \ldots, (x_n, d_n)\},$$

are equivalent if subsets $A, B \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$ exist such that there is an equality of multisets $I \setminus \{(x_\alpha, 0) : \alpha \in A\} = J \setminus \{(x_\beta, 0) : \beta \in B\}$.

If $\mathcal{W}_i \subseteq ([0,\infty) \times [0,\infty))^n$ is the subset of n-tuples of pairs $(x_1, d_1, x_2, d_2, \ldots, x_n, d_n)$, with 0 persistence, i.e. $d_i = 0$, then these functions are precisely the 2-symmetric max-plus polynomials whose restriction to $\mathcal{W}_i$ is independent of x_i for all i.

Lemma 4.1. *Let the minimal representation of a max-plus polynomial $p(x_1, d_1, \ldots, x_n, d_n)$ be*

$$\boxplus_{i=1\ldots,m} a_0^i \odot x_1^{a_1^i} \odot d_1^{b_1^i} \odot \ldots \odot x_n^{a_n^i} \odot d_n^{b_n^i}.$$

Then p restricted to $\mathcal{W}_j$ is independent of x_j if and only if $a_j^i = 0$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, m$.

Proof. The direction ($\Leftarrow$) follows immediately. We must show ($\Rightarrow$). Suppose not all a_j^i are 0. Let i_0 be such that

$$|a_j^{i_0}| = \max\{|a_j^i|\,;\, i = 1, \ldots, m\}.$$

If $a_j^{i_0} > 0$, then $p(0, \ldots, 0, x_j, 0, \ldots, 0) = a_0^{i_0} \odot x_j^{a_j^{i_0}}$ for x_j sufficiently big. In this case $p(x_1, d_1, \ldots, x_n, d_n)$ depends on x_j. By assumption $a_j^{i_0} \geq 0$. This implies that the only way the expression does not depend on x_j is if $a_j^{i_0} = 0$. □

Corollary 4.2. *The subsemiring of max-plus polynomials whose restriction to $\mathcal{W}_i$ is independent of x_i for all i contains precisely the max-plus polynomials of the form*

$$\boxplus_{i=1\ldots,m} a_0^i \odot d_1^{b_1^i} \odot \ldots \odot d_n^{b_n^i}.$$

We denote this semiring by D_n.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $D_n^{S_n}$ denote the subring of elements of D_n which are invariant under the action of S_n. Then $\sigma_{[(0,1)]}, \sigma_{[(0,1)^2]}, \ldots, \sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}$ generate D^{S_n}, in the sense that any element of D^{S_n} is of the form*

$$\boxplus_{i=1\ldots,m} a_0^i \odot \sigma_{[(0,1)]}^{b_1^i} \odot \ldots \odot \sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}^{b_n^i},$$

where $a_0^i \in \mathbb{R}$ and all b_j^i nonnegative integers.

Proof. The statement follows from Theorem 2.6. □

Now that we have identified appropriate functions for each B_n separately, we must assemble them to get functions on the barcode space. When $n \geq m$, the natural inclusion

$$\begin{array}{rcl} B_m & \to & B_n \\ \{(x_1, d_1), \ldots, (x_m, d_m)\} & \mapsto & \{(x_1, d_1), \ldots, (x_m, d_m), (0,0), \ldots, (0,0)\} \end{array}$$

induces $i_{n,m} \colon D_n \to D_m$, defined by

$$i_{n,m}(f)((x_1, d_1), \ldots, (x_m, d_m)) = f((x_1, d_1), \ldots, (x_m, d_m), (0,0), \ldots, (0,0)),$$

The map $i_{n,m}$ is S_m-equivariant (S_m acts by permuting the first m pairs of variables). It follows that we may construct composites

$$i_n^m \colon D_n^{S_n} \hookrightarrow D_n^{S_m} \xrightarrow{i_{n,m}^{S_m}} D_m^{S_m}$$

and an inverse system

$$\ldots \xrightarrow{i_n^{n+1}} D_n^{S_n} \xrightarrow{i_{n-1}^n} D_{n-1}^{S_{n-1}} \xrightarrow{i_{n-2}^{n-1}} \ldots \xrightarrow{i_1^2} D_1^{S_1}.$$

Observe that

$$i^n_{n-1}(\sigma_{[(0,1)^k]}) = i^n_{n-1}(\sigma_{\underbrace{(0,1),\ldots,(0,1)}_{\mathrm{k}}}) = \sigma_{(0,1)^k} \text{ for } k \neq n \quad \text{and} \quad i^n_{n-1}(\sigma_{(0,1)^n}) = \sigma_{(0,1)^{n-1}}.$$

Therefore i^n_{n-1} are surjections for all positive integers n. We do not wish to include functions with infinitely many variables, such as $\max_{i\in\mathbb{N}} x_i$, and for this reason we take a filtered inverse limit of these objects instead of the inverse limit. The total degree is the filter we use. Recall that $\operatorname{Deg} p$ of a max-plus polynomial

$$p(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) = a_1 \odot x_1^{i_1^1} x_2^{i_2^1} \ldots x_n^{i_n^1} \boxplus a_2 \odot x_1^{i_1^2} x_2^{i_2^2} \ldots x_n^{i_n^2} \boxplus \ldots \boxplus a_m \odot x_1^{i_1^m} x_2^{i_2^m} \ldots x_n^{i_n^m}$$

is $\max_{1\leq j\leq m}(i_1^j + i_2^j + \ldots + i_n^j)$. Let

$${}_kD_n = \{p \in D_n \,|\, \operatorname{Deg} p \leq k\}$$

Map i^n_{n-1} induces ${}_ki^n_{n-1}\colon {}_kD_n^{S_n} \xrightarrow{{}^ki^n_{n-1}} {}_kD_{n-1}^{S_{n-1}}$. We denote the inverse limit of this system by $\mathscr{D}^k$. The space of max-plus polynomials on the barcode space, $\mathscr{D}$, is precisely $\cup_{k=1}^{\infty}\mathscr{D}^k$.

Definition 4.4. A semiring $(\mathscr{R}, +, \cdot)$ is called *filtered* if there exists such a family of subsemirings $\{\mathscr{R}_d\}_{d\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $(\mathscr{R}, +, \cdot)$ for operation $+$ that

- $\mathscr{R}_d \subset \mathscr{R}_{d'}$ for $d \leq d'$,
- $\mathscr{R} = \bigcup_d \mathscr{R}_d$,
- $\mathscr{R}_d \cdot \mathscr{R}_{d'} \subset \mathscr{R}_{d+d'}$ for all $d, d' \in \mathbb{N}$.

Theorem 4.5. *Max-plus polynomials on the barcode space, $\mathscr{D}$, have the structure of a filtered semiring. They are generated by elements of the form $\sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}$, where n is a positive integer.*

5 Stability of Max-Plus Polynomials

Stability is the key property that coordinate functions should satisfy. In this section we prove that the functions from $\mathscr{D}$ are stable with respect to the bottleneck and Wasserstein distances.

Theorem 5.1 (Bottleneck stability of max-plus polynomials)**.** *Let $\mathscr{D}$ be the filtered semiring of max-plus polynomials. If $F \in \mathscr{D}$, then a constant C exists such that*

$$|F(\mathscr{B}_1) - F(\mathscr{B}_2)| \leq C\, d_\infty(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2)$$

for any pair of barcodes $\mathscr{B}_1$ and $\mathscr{B}_2$.

Lemma 5.2. *A constant C exists such that*

$$|\sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_1) - \sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_2)| \leq C\, d_\infty(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2)$$

for any pair of barcodes $\mathscr{B}_1$ and $\mathscr{B}_2$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let $\mathscr{B}_1 = \{(x_1, d_1), \ldots, (x_{l_1}, d_{l_1})\}$ and $\mathscr{B}_2 = \{(x'_1, d'_1), \ldots, (x'_{l_2}, d'_{l_2})\}$ be such that $\mathscr{B}_1 \neq \mathscr{B}_2$ and $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \ldots \geq d_{l_1} \geq 0$.

Without loss of generality assume that $\sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_1) \geq \sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_2)$. If $n > l_1$ or $n > l_2$, we add 0 length intervals to $\mathscr{B}_1$, $\mathscr{B}_2$ to achieve that their length is n.

Let θ be a bijection where the penalty is minimal, i.e. where $P_\infty(\theta) = \mathrm{d}_\infty(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2)$. Assume that θ matches (x_1, d_1) with (x'_1, d'_1), (x_2, d_2) with (x'_2, d'_2), $\ldots$, (x_n, d_n) with (x'_n, d'_n) (some of these intervals might be 0 length intervals). Note that for those i, for which either d_i or $d_{i'}$ equals 0, we automatically have

$$|\frac{d_i - d'_i}{2}| \leq \mathrm{d}_\infty(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2).$$

For all other i in this matching,

$$|\frac{d_i - d'_i}{2}| \leq \max_{i=1,\ldots,m}(|x_i - x'_i|, |d_i - d'_i + x_i - x'_i|) \leq \mathrm{d}_\infty(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2). \tag{5.3}$$

By the definition of a minimal matching $\max_{i=1,\ldots,m}(|x_i - x'_i|, |d_i - d'_i + x_i - x'_i|) \leq \mathrm{d}_\infty(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2)$. So we must only prove the first inequality. Notice that if $|\frac{d_i - d'_i}{2}| \leq |x_i - x'_i|$, this follows automatically. If $|\frac{d_i - d'_i}{2}| > |x_i - x'_i|$, then

$$|\frac{d_i - d'_i}{2}| \leq |d_i - d'_i + x_i - x'_i|,$$

proving Inequality 5.3.

Then

$$\begin{array}{rcl} n\mathrm{d}_\infty(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2) & \geq & \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(d_i - d'_i)}{2} \\ & = & \frac{1}{2}(\sum_{i=1}^n d_i - \sum_{i=1}^n d'_i) \\ & = & \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_1) - \sum_{i=1}^n d'_i) \\ & \geq & \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_1) - \sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_2)). \end{array}$$

The last inequality holds since $\sum_{i=1}^n d'_i \leq \sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_2)$. Also note that we chose $d_1, \ldots, d_n$ in a way that $\sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_1) = \sum_{i=1}^n d_i$.

We deduce that

$$|\sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_1) - \sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_2)| \leq 2n\mathrm{d}_\infty(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2),$$

proving that $\sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}$ is Lipschitz with constant $2n$. □

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Any function F from the filtered semiring of max-plus polynomials is generated by taking maxima and sums of $\sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}$. Since stability is preserved under these two operations and since the $\sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}$ are stable according to Lemma 5.2, F is also stable. □

Theorem 5.4 (Wasserstein stability of max-plus polynomials)**.** *Let $\mathscr{D}$ be the filtered semiring of max-plus polynomials. If $F \in \mathscr{D}$, then a constant C exists such that*

$$|F(\mathscr{B}_1) - F(\mathscr{B}_2)| \leq C\, d_q(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2)$$

for any pair of barcodes $\mathscr{B}_1$ and $\mathscr{B}_2$.

Proof. Let $\mathscr{B}_1 = \{(x_1, d_1), \ldots, (x_{l_1}, d_{l_1})\}$ and $\mathscr{B}_2 = \{(x'_1, d'_1), \ldots, (x'_{l_2}, d'_{l_2})\}$ be such that $\mathscr{B}_1 \neq \mathscr{B}_2$ and $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \ldots \geq d_{l_1} \geq 0$.

Without loss of generality assume that $\sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_1) \geq \sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_2)$. If $n > l_1$ or $n > l_2$, we add 0 length intervals to $\mathscr{B}_1$, $\mathscr{B}_2$ to achieve that their length is n.

Let θ be a bijection where the penalty is minimal, i.e. where $P_q(\theta) = \mathrm{d}_q(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2)$. Assume that θ matches (x_1, d_1) with (x'_1, d'_1), (x_2, d_2) with (x'_2, d'_2), …, (x_n, d_n) with (x'_n, d'_n) (some of these intervals might be 0 length intervals).

Note that for those i, for which either d_i or $d_{i'}$ equals 0, we automatically have

$$|\frac{d_i - d'_i}{2}| \leq \mathrm{d}_\infty(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2).$$

For all other i in this matching,

$$|\frac{d_i - d'_i}{2}|^q \leq \max_{i=1,\ldots,m} (|x_i - x'_i|, |d_i - d'_i + x_i - x'_i|)^q$$

since $x \mapsto x^q$ is increasing for $x > 0$ (note that $q \geq 1$). Then

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (\sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_1) - \sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_2))^q & \leq & (\sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_1) - \sum_{i=1}^n d'_i)^q \\ & = & (\sum_{i=1}^n d_i - \sum_{i=1}^n d'_i)^q \\ & \leq & 2^q (\sum_{i=1}^n |\frac{d_i - d'_i}{2}|)^q \\ & \leq & 2^q (n)^{q-1} (\sum_{i=1}^n |\frac{d_i - d'_i}{2}|^q) \\ & \leq & 2^q (n)^{q-1} P_q(\theta)^q \\ & = & 2^q n^{q-1} \mathrm{d}_q(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2)^q. \end{array}$$

The first inequality holds since $\sum_{i=1}^n d'_i \leq \sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_2)$. Also note that we chose $d_1, \ldots, d_n$ in a way that $\sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_1) = \sum_{i=1}^n d_i$. To bound $\sum_{i=1}^n |\frac{d_i - d'_i}{2}|^q$ we use Hőlder's inequality.

It follows from here that

$$|\sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_1) - \sigma_{[(0,1)^n]}(\mathscr{B}_2)| \leq 2n^{\frac{q-1}{q}} \mathrm{d}_q(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2)$$

□

6 Tropical Rational Functions on the Barcode Space

While the the functions belonging to $\mathscr{D}$ are stable and can be used to assign vectors to barcodes, they do not separate points in the barcode space. Because there simply are not enough functions among max-plus polynomials to separate points, we expand the set of functions we observe to all tropical rational functions.

Let

$$((x_1, d_1), \ldots, (x_n, d_n)), ((x'_1, d'_1), \ldots, (x'_n, d'_n)) \in [0, \infty)^{2n}.$$

Without loss of generality we assume that they are lexicographically ordered.

The tropical rational functions that respect the equivalence classes of B_n, must respect the following equivalence relation $\sim$ on $[0, \infty)^{2n}$:

$$((x_1, d_1), \ldots, (x_n, d_n)) \sim ((x'_1, d'_1), \ldots, (x'_n, d'_n)) \Leftrightarrow \forall i : \, d_i = d'_i \wedge (x_i = x'_i \vee d_i = 0).$$

We denote the semiring of such functions by R_n.

Theorem 6.1. *No finite subset of R_n exists which separates nonequivalent points in B_n.*

Proof. Assume $\{f_1, \ldots, f_m\} \in R_n$ separates nonequivalent points in B_n. Let $\vec{x} = (x_1, d_1, \ldots, x_n, d_n)$ and $\vec{x}' = (x'_1, d'_1, \ldots, x'_n, d'_n)$. We define

$$g(\vec{x}, \vec{x}') = \max\{|f_1(\vec{x}) - f_1(\vec{x}')|, \ldots, |f_m(\vec{x}) - f_m(\vec{x}')|\}.$$

The function g is the 1-distance between vectors $(f_1(\vec{x}), \ldots, f_n(\vec{x}))$ and $(f_1(\vec{x}'), \ldots, f_n(\vec{x}'))$. Thus $g(\vec{x}, \vec{x}') = 0$ if and only if $\vec{x}$ and $\vec{x}'$ are equivalent points.

Since $|x| = \max(x, -x)$, g is a tropical rational function and as demonstrated in Section 2.1 we can write $g(\vec{x}, \vec{x}')$ as

$$\max_{i=1,\ldots,l_1} (\sum_{k=1}^{n} (a_{k,i} x_k + b_{k,i} d_k) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} (a'_{k,i} x'_k + b'_{k,i} d'_k) + c_i) - \max_{j=1,\ldots,l_2} (\sum_{k=1}^{n} (s_{k,j} x_k + t_{k,j} d_k) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} (s'_{k,j} x'_k + t'_{k,j} d'_k) + u_j). \quad (6.2)$$

For $\vec{x}_0 = (x, 0, \ldots, x, 0)$ and $\vec{y}_0 = (y, 0, \ldots, y, 0)$, $g(\vec{x}_0, \vec{y}_0) = 0$ and consequently

$$\max_{i=1,\ldots,l_1} (x \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{k,i} + y \sum_{k=1}^{n} a'_{k,i} + c_i) = \max_{j=1,\ldots,l_2} (x \sum_{k=1}^{n} s_{k,j} + y \sum_{k=1}^{n} s'_{k,j} + u_j).$$

$\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{k,i}$ cannot be 0 for all i unless $\sum_{k=1}^{n} s_{k,i}$ is 0 for all i (if they were not, we could set y to 0 and choose a large x to make the right hand side of the equation larger than the left hand side). The same holds for $\sum_{k=1}^{n} a'_{k,i}$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{n} s'_{k,i}$. If $\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{k,i}$, $\sum_{k=1}^{n} a'_{k,i}$,

$\sum_{k=1}^{n} s_{k,i}$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{n} s'_{k,i}$ are 0 for all i, then g is independent of $x_1, \ldots, x_n, x'_1, \ldots, x'_n$. This cannot happen since when $n = 1$ it would imply that

$$0 = g(1, 1, 1, 1) = g(1, 1, 2, 1) \neq 0.$$

We can construct a similar example for other n. It follows that $\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{k,i}$, $\sum_{k=1}^{n} a'_{k,i}$, $\sum_{k=1}^{n} s_{k,i}$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{n} s'_{k,i}$ do not all equal 0 for all i. Choose

$$x, y > \frac{\max\limits_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{\leq l_1}} (u_i, c_i)}{\min(\max\limits_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{\leq l_1}} (\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{k,i} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{k,i}), \max\limits_{i \in \mathbb{N}_{\leq l_2}} (\sum_{k=1}^{n} s_{k,i} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} s'_{k,i}))}.$$

We denote the set of indices for which the maximum of $\max\limits_{j=1,\ldots,l_2} (x \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{k,i} + y \sum_{k=1}^{n} a'_{k,i} + c_i)$ is attained at $x \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{k,i} + y \sum_{k=1}^{n} a'_{k,i} + c_i$ by I. We define J to be the set of indices where $\max\limits_{j=1,\ldots,l_2} (x \sum_{k=1}^{n} s_{k,j} + y \sum_{k=1}^{n} s'_{k,j} + u_j)$ is attained at $x \sum_{k=1}^{n} s_{k,j} + y \sum_{k=1}^{n} s'_{k,j} + u_j$.

Let $i \in I$ and $j \in J$. Since

$$x \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{k,i} + y \sum_{k=1}^{n} a'_{k,i} + c_i = x \sum_{k=1}^{n} s_{k,j} + y \sum_{k=1}^{n} s'_{k,j} + u_j$$

for all big enough x and y, $\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_{k,i} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} s_{k,j}$, $\sum_{k=1}^{n} a'_{k,i} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} s'_{k,j}$ and $c_i = u_j$.

For any index i let S_i denote the set of all such $(\vec{x}, \vec{x}') \in [0, \infty)^{2n} \times [0, \infty)^{2n}$ that

$$\max_{i=1,\ldots,l_1} (\sum_{k=1}^{n} (a_{k,i} x_k + b_{k,i} d_k) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} (a'_{k,i} x'_k + b'_{k,i} d'_k) + c_i)$$

is attained in i. We similarly define T_j to be the set of all such $(\vec{x}, \vec{x}')$ that

$$\max_{j=1,\ldots,l_2} (\sum_{k=1}^{n} (s_{k,i} x_k + t_{k,i} d_k) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} (s'_{k,i} x'_k + t'_{k,i} d'_k) + u_i)$$

is attained in j. The sets S_i and T_j are closed for all i and j. Let

$$U = [0, \infty)^{2n} \times [0, \infty)^{2n} \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{i \notin I} S_i \cup \bigcup_{j \notin J} T_j \Big)$$

Since $(\vec{x}_0, \vec{y}_0) \in U$ and U is open in $[0, \infty)^{2n} \times [0, \infty)^{2n}$, a positive ϵ exists such that

$([x, x+\epsilon] \times [0, \epsilon])^n \times ([y, y+\epsilon] \times [0, \epsilon])^n \subseteq U$. There exist such $i_0 \in I$ and $j_0 \in J$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= g((x, \epsilon, \ldots, x, \epsilon), (x, \epsilon, \ldots, x, \epsilon)) \\
&= x \sum_{k=1}^n a_{k,i_0} + x \sum_{k=1}^n a'_{k,i_0} + \epsilon \sum_{k=1}^n (b_{k,i_0} + b'_{k,i_0}) + c_{i_0} - \\
&\quad (x \sum_{k=1}^n s_{k,j_0} + x \sum_{k=1}^n s'_{k,j_0} + \epsilon \sum_{k=1}^n (t_{k,j_0} + t'_{k,j_0}) + u_{j_0}) \\
&= (\epsilon \sum_{k=1}^n (b_{k,i_0} + b'_{k,i_0}) + c_{i_0}) - (\epsilon \sum_{k=1}^n (t_{k,j_0} + t'_{k,j_0}) + u_{j_0}) \\
&= x \sum_{k=1}^n a_{k,i_0} + y \sum_{k=1}^n a'_{k,i_0} + \epsilon \sum_{k=1}^n (b_{k,i_0} + b'_{k,i_0}) + c_{i_0} - \\
&\quad (x \sum_{k=1}^n s_{k,j_0} + y \sum_{k=1}^n s'_{k,j_0} + \epsilon \sum_{k=1}^n (t_{k,j_0} + t'_{k,j_0}) + u_{j_0}) \\
&= g((x, \epsilon, \ldots, x, \epsilon), (y, \epsilon, \ldots, y, \epsilon)).
\end{aligned}$$

We choose such x and y that $x \neq y$. For this choice, $g((x, \epsilon, \ldots, x, \epsilon), (y, \epsilon, \ldots, y, \epsilon)) \neq 0$, which is a contradiction. □

Theorem 6.1 states that no finite subset of symmetric min-plus, max-plus or tropical rational functions exists that separates barcodes. In this section we identify a countable set of tropical rational functions on the barcode space that does.

Theorem 6.3. *Let $\{\sigma_{(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}\}$ be the set of elementary 2-symmetric max-plus polynomials from Definition 2.8. Functions, defined by*

$$E_{m,(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}(x_1, d_1, \ldots, x_n, d_n) := \sigma_{(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}(x_1 \oplus d_1^m, d_1, \ldots, x_n \oplus d_n^m, d_n),$$

for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_{\leq n}$ are contained in R_n. Furthermore, they separate nonequivalent points in B_n.

Proof. Restricted to $d_i = 0$, expressions $x_i \oplus d_i^m$ are 0 and therefore independent of x_i and consequently so are their post-compositions with $e_{(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}$. This implies that $E_{m,(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}(x_1, d_1, \ldots, x_n, d_n)$ is contained in R_n.

We must show that if $(x_1, d_1, \ldots, x_n, d_n)$ and $(x'_1, d'_1, \ldots, x'_n, d'_n)$ are not equivalent in B_n, we can find such $E_{m,(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}$ that

$$E_{m,(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}(x_1, d_1, \ldots, x_n, d_n) \neq E_{m,(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}(x'_1, d'_1, \ldots, x'_n, d'_n).$$

Let $(x_1, d_1, \ldots, x_n, d_n)$ and $(x'_1, d'_1, \ldots, x'_n, d'_n)$ be nonequivalent. Without loss of generality assume that $d_1 \leq \ldots \leq d_n$ and $d'_1 \leq \ldots \leq d'_n$.

Some of the d's, say $d_1, \ldots, d_{k-1} = 0$ can be 0 (if $k = 1$ none of d's is 0). The point $(x_1, 0, \ldots, x_{k-1}, 0, x_k, d_k, \ldots x_n, d_n)$ is equivalent to $(0, 0, \ldots, 0, 0, x_k, d_k, \ldots x_n, d_n)$ and consequently

$$\begin{aligned}
&E_{m,(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}(x_1, 0, \ldots, x_{k-1}, 0, x_k, d_k, \ldots x_n, d_n) = \\
&\qquad E_{m,(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}(0, 0, \ldots, 0, 0, x_k, d_k, \ldots x_n, d_n) \quad (6.4)
\end{aligned}$$

for all m and $(e_{1,1}, e_{1,2}), \ldots, (e_{n,1}, e_{n,2})$. Similarly, if $d'_1, \ldots, d'_{l-1} = 0$, then

$$(x'_1, 0, \ldots, x'_{l-1}, 0, x'_l, d'_l, \ldots x'_n, d'_n) \sim (0, 0, \ldots, 0, 0, x'_l, d'_l, \ldots x'_n, d'_n)$$

and consequently

$$E_{m,(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}(x'_1,0,\ldots,x'_{l-1},0,x'_l,d'_l,\ldots x'_n,d'_n) = \\ E_{m,(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}(0,0,\ldots,0,0,x'_l,d'_l,\ldots x'_n,d'_n) \quad (6.5)$$

for all m and $(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})$.

Choose $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$m > \max(\max_{k\le i\le n}\frac{x_i}{d_i}, \max_{l\le i\le n}\frac{x'_i}{d'_i}).$$

For this m,

$$(x_1 \oplus d_1^m, d_1, \ldots, x_n \oplus d_n^m, d_n) = (0,0,\ldots,0,0,x_k,d_k,\ldots x_n,d_n)$$

and

$$(x'_1 \oplus d_1'^m, d'_1, \ldots, x'_n \oplus d_n'^m, d_n) = (0,0,\ldots,0,0,x'_l,d'_l,\ldots x'_n,d'_n)$$

Theorem 2.9 guarantees existence of such $e \in \{\sigma_{(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}\}$ that

$$e(0,0,\ldots,0,0,x_k,d_k,\ldots x_n,d_n) \neq e(0,0,\ldots,0,0,x'_l,d'_l,\ldots x'_n,d'_n).$$

If we now take $E_{m,e}$ for this choice of m and this e,

$$E_{m,e}(x_1,d_1,\ldots x_n,d_n) \neq E_{m,e}(x'_1,d'_1,\ldots,x'_n,d'_n)$$

and we are done. □

It is hard to characterize *all* tropical rational functions on B_n, so we work with a subsemiring of functions obtained by taking maxima, adding and substracting functions from $\{E_{m,(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}\}$. We denote this subsemiring by G_n or $G_n^{S_n}$ when we wish to stress that all the functions contained in it are symmetric. We have restriction maps $i_{n,m}\colon G_n \to G_m$, when $n \ge m$, induced by

$$i_{n,m}(f)(x_1,d_1,\ldots,x_m,d_m,\ldots,x_n,d_n) = f(x_1,d_1,\ldots,x_m,d_m,0,0,\ldots,0,0),$$

The map $i_{n,m}$ is S_m-equivariant, where S_m acts by permuting the first m pairs of variables.

Maps $i_{n,n-1}$ transform the generators of G_n as follows:

$$E_{m,(0,0)^j(1,0)^k(0,1)^l(1,1)^p} \mapsto \begin{cases} E_{m,(0,0)^{j-1}(1,0)^k(0,1)^l(1,1)^p} & \text{if } j \neq 0 \\ E_{m,(1,1)^{n-1}} & \text{if } j=0, k=0, l=0 \\ E_{m,(0,1)^{l-1}(1,1)^p} & \text{if } j=0, k=0, l\ge 1 \\ E_{m,(1,0)^{k-1}(1,1)^p} & \text{if } j=0, k\ge, l=0 \\ E_{m,(1,0)^{k-1}(0,1)^l(1,1)^p} \boxplus E_{m,(1,0)^k(0,1)^{l-1}(1,1)^p} & \text{if } j=0, k\ge, l\ge 1 \end{cases}$$

Here $p = n - l - k - j$. Therefore we $i_{n,n-1}$ is a surjection from G_n to G_{n-1} and we may construct composites

$$i_n^{n-1} \colon G_n^{S_n} \hookrightarrow G_n^{S_{n-1}} \xrightarrow{i_{n,n-1}^{S_{n-1}}} G_{n-1}^{S_{n-1}}.$$

We cannot proceed as we did in the case of max-plus polynomials, since we cannot define a degree of a tropical rational expression. However, recall that according to Section 2.1 we can write any $r \in G_n$ as

$$\max_{i=1,\dots,l_1} (\sum_{k=1}^{n} (a_{k,i}x_k + b_{k,i}d_k) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} (a'_{k,i}x'_k + b'_{k,i}d'_k) + c_i) - \max_{j=1,\dots,l_2} (\sum_{k=1}^{n} (s_{k,j}x_k + t_{k,j}d_k) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} (s'_{k,j}x'_k + t'_{k,j}d'_k) + u_j). \quad (6.6)$$

Now set

$${}_kG_n^{S_n} = \{r \in G_n \mid r \sim p \oplus q^{-1}, p, q \text{ are max-plus polynomials with } \deg p, \deg q \leq k\}$$

Map i_n^{n-1} induces ${}_ki_n^{n-1} \colon {}_kG_n^{S_n} \xrightarrow{{}_ki_n^{n-1}} {}_kG_{n-1}^{S_{n-1}}$. We denote the inverse limit of this system by $\mathscr{G}^k$. Let $\mathscr{G} = \cup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathscr{G}^k$.

Theorem 6.7. *Tropical rational functions in $\mathscr{G}$ form a filtered semiring and they separate points in the barcode space. As a semiring $\mathscr{G}$ is generated by elements of the form $E_{m,(1,0)^k(0,1)^l(1,1)^p}$ where k, l, p are nonnegative integers and m is a positive integer.*

7 Stability of Tropical Rational Functions in $\mathscr{G}$

Theorem 7.1 (Bottleneck stability of functions in $\mathscr{G}$)**.** *If $F \in \mathscr{G}$, then a constant C exists such that*

$$|F(\mathscr{B}_1) - F(\mathscr{B}_2)| \leq C\, d_\infty(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2)$$

for any pair of barcodes $\mathscr{B}_1$ and $\mathscr{B}_2$.

Lemma 7.2. *Let $m_i = \min\{x_i, md_i\}$ and $m_j = \min\{x_j, md_j\}$. Then*

$$|m_i - m_j| \leq 2m \max(|x_i - x_j|, |d_i - d_j + x_i - x_j|).$$

Proof. If $x_i \leq md_i$ and $x_j \leq md_j$, then

$$|m_i - m_j| = |x_i - x_j|.$$

If $x_i \geq md_i$ and $x_j \geq md_j$, then

$$|m_i - m_j| = |md_i - md_j| = m|d_i - d_j|.$$

Let $x_i \leq md_i$ and $x_j > md_j$ (the case when $x_i > md_i$ and $x_j \leq md_j$ is analogous). Since $0 \leq x_i \leq md_i$,

$$-md_j \leq x_i - md_j \leq m(d_i - d_j).$$

On the other hand $-x_j < -md_j \leq 0$ and consequently

$$x_i - x_j < x_i - md_j \leq x_i.$$

It follows that

$$|x_i - md_j| \leq \max\{|x_i - x_j|, m|d_i - d_j|\}$$

and consequently

$$|m_i - m_j| \leq \max\{|x_i - x_j|, m|d_i - d_j|\} \leq m \max\{|x_i - x_j|, |d_i - d_j|\}.$$

By triangle inequality

$$|d_i - d_j| \leq |d_i - d_j + x_i - x_j| + |x_i - x_j| \leq 2\max(|x_i - x_j|, |d_i - d_j + x_i - x_j|).$$

Finally these two inequalities imply

$$\max(|x_i - x_j|, |d_i - d_j + x_i - x_j|) \leq 2m \max(|x_i - x_j|, |d_i - d_j + x_i - x_j|)$$

□

Proof of Theorem 7.1. Take $E = E_{m,(0,1)^l(1,0)^k(1,1)^p}$. Let $\mathscr{B}_1 = \{(x_1, d_1), \ldots, (x_{l_1}, d_{l_1})\}$ and $\mathscr{B}_2 = \{(x'_1, d'_1), \ldots, (x'_{l_2}, d'_{l_2})\}$ be such that $\mathscr{B}_1 \neq \mathscr{B}_2$. Without loss of generality assume that

$$E_{m,(0,1)^l(1,0)^k(1,1)^p}(\mathscr{B}_1) \geq E_{m,(0,1)^l(1,0)^k(1,1)^p}(\mathscr{B}_2)$$

and

$$E_{m,(0,1)^l(1,0)^k(1,1)^p}(\mathscr{B}_1) = \sum_{i=1}^{p}(m_i + d_i) + \sum_{i=p+1}^{p+k} m_i + \sum_{i=p+k+1}^{p+k+l} d_i.$$

If $l_1, l_2 < p + k + l$, we add 0 length intervals to both barcodes.

Let θ be a bijection where the penalty is minimal, i.e. where $P_\infty(\theta) = \mathrm{d}_\infty(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2)$. Assume that θ matches (x_1, d_1) with (x'_1, d'_1), (x_2, d_2) with (x'_2, d'_2), $\ldots$, (x_{p+k+l}, d_{p+k+l}) with (x'_{p+k+l}, d'_{p+k+l}). Recall that for all i in this matching,

$$|\frac{d_i - d'_i}{2}| \leq \max_{i=1,\ldots,m}(|x_i - x'_i|, |d_i - d'_i + x_i - x'_i|).$$

Let's also check what happens if $d'_i = 0$. In this case, (x_i, d_i) is matched to a 0 length barcode and

$$d_i \leq 2\mathrm{d}_\infty(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2), \quad m_i \leq md_i \leq 2m\mathrm{d}_\infty(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2)$$

and

$$d_i + m_i \leq (2 + 2m)\mathrm{d}_\infty(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2).$$

Let $M = \max\{1, m\}$. Using Lemma 7.2 and the above inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
E(\mathscr{B}_1) - E(\mathscr{B}_2) &= \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{p}(m_i + d_i) + \sum_{i=p+1}^{p+k} m_i + \sum_{i=p+k+1}^{p+k+l} d_i - E(\mathscr{B}_2) \\
&\leq \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{p}(m_i - m_i' + d_i - d_i') + \sum_{i=p+1}^{p+k}(m_i - m_i') + \sum_{i=p+k+1}^{p+k+l}(d_i - d_i') \\
&= 2|\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{p}\frac{m_i - m_i'}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^{p}\frac{d_i - d_i'}{2} + \sum_{i=p+1}^{p+k}\frac{m_i - m_i'}{2} + \sum_{i=p+k+1}^{p+k+l}\frac{d_i - d_i'}{2}| \\
&\leq 2(\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{p}|\frac{m_i - m_i'}{2}| + \sum_{i=1}^{p}|\frac{d_i - d_i'}{2}| + \sum_{i=p+1}^{p+k}|\frac{m_i - m_i'}{2}| + \sum_{i=p+k+1}^{p+k+l}|\frac{d_i - d_i'}{2}|) \\
&\leq 2(2pMP_\infty(\theta) + 2pP_\infty(\theta) + 2kMP_\infty(\theta) + 2lP_\infty(\theta)) \\
&\leq 2(2pM + 2p + 2kM + 2l)\mathrm{d}_\infty(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves that E is Lipschitz. In Proof of Theorem 5.1 we showed that stable functions on the barcode space are preserved under taking sums, maxima and minima. Since $E_{m,(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}$ are stable as any $F \in \mathscr{G}$ is composed of taking sums, maxima and minima of $E_{m,(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}$. □

Theorem 7.3 (Wasserstein stability of functions in $\mathscr{G}$)**.** *If $F \in \mathscr{G}$, then a constant C exists such that*

$$|F(\mathscr{B}_1) - F(\mathscr{B}_2)| \leq C\, d_q(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2)$$

for any pair of barcodes $\mathscr{B}_1$ and $\mathscr{B}_2$.

Proof. We denote the function $E_{m,(0,1)^l(1,0)^k(1,1)^p}$ by E. Let $\mathscr{B}_1 = \{(x_1, d_1), \ldots, (x_{l_1}, d_{l_1})\}$ and $\mathscr{B}_2 = \{(x_1', d_1'), \ldots, (x_{l_2}', d_{l_2}')\}$ be such that $\mathscr{B}_1 \neq \mathscr{B}_2$. Without loss of generality assume that

$$E_{m,(0,1)^l(1,0)^k(1,1)^p}(\mathscr{B}_1) \geq E_{m,(0,1)^l(1,0)^k(1,1)^p}(\mathscr{B}_2)$$

and

$$E_{m,(0,1)^l(1,0)^k(1,1)^p}(\mathscr{B}_1) = \sum_{i=1}^{p}(m_i + d_i) + \sum_{i=p+1}^{p+k} m_i + \sum_{i=p+k+1}^{p+k+l} d_i.$$

If $l_1, l_2 < p + k + l$, we add 0 length intervals to both barcodes.

Let θ be a bijection where the penalty is minimal, i.e. where $P_\infty(\theta) = \mathrm{d}_q(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2)$. Assume that θ matches (x_1, d_1) with (x_1', d_1'), (x_2, d_2) with (x_2', d_2'), $\ldots$, (x_{p+k+l}, d_{p+k+l}) with (x_{p+k+l}', d_{p+k+l}'). Recall that for all i in this matching,

$$|\frac{d_i - d_i'}{2}|^q \leq \max_{i=1,\ldots,m}(|x_i - x_i'|, |d_i - d_i' + x_i - x_i'|)^q$$

since $x \mapsto x^q$ is increasing for $x > 0$. As before, if $d_i' = 0$, (x_i, d_i) is matched to a 0 length barcode and

$$d_i \leq 2\mathrm{d}_q(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2), \quad m_i \leq m d_i \leq 2m\mathrm{d}_q(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2)$$

and

$$d_i + m_i \leq (2 + 2m)\mathrm{d}_q(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2).$$

Let $M = \max\{1, m\}$. Using Lemma 7.2 and the above inequalities, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
|E(\mathscr{B}_1) - E(\mathscr{B}_2)|^q &= (\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{p}(m_i + d_i) + \sum_{i=p+1}^{p+k} m_i + \sum_{i=p+k+1}^{p+k+l} d_i - E(\mathscr{B}_2))^q \\
&\leq (\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{p}(m_i - m_i' + d_i - d_i') + \sum_{i=p+1}^{p+k}(m_i - m_i') + \sum_{i=p+k+1}^{p+k+l}(d_i - d_i'))^q \\
&= 2^q|\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{p}\frac{m_i - m_i'}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^{p}\frac{d_i - d_i'}{2} + \sum_{i=p+1}^{p+k}\frac{m_i - m_i'}{2} + \sum_{i=p+k+1}^{p+k+l}\frac{d_i - d_i'}{2}|^q \\
&\leq 2^q(\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{p}|\frac{m_i - m_i'}{2}| + \sum_{i=1}^{p}|\frac{d_i - d_i'}{2}| + \sum_{i=p+1}^{p+k}|\frac{m_i - m_i'}{2}| + \sum_{i=p+k+1}^{p+k+l}|\frac{d_i - d_i'}{2}|)^q \\
&\leq 2^q(2p + k + l)^{q-1}(2pM + 2p + 2kM + 2l)^q P_q(\theta)^q \\
&\leq 2^q(2pM + 2p + 2kM + 2l)^{2q}\mathrm{d}_q(\mathscr{B}_1, \mathscr{B}_2)^q.
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality holds since $\sum_{i=1}^{p}(m_i'+d_i')+\sum_{i=p+1}^{p+k} m_i'+\sum_{i=p+k+1}^{p+k+l} d_i' \leq E(\mathscr{B}_2)$. Second to last inequality uses Hőlder's inequality. Taking the q-th root finishes the proof.

We conclude that E is Lipschitz. In Proof of Theorem 5.1 we showed that stable functions on the barcode space are preserved under taking sums, maxima and minima. Since $E_{m,(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}$ are stable, $F \in \mathscr{G}$ is also stable as it is composed of taking sums, maxima and minima of $E_{m,(e_{1,1},e_{1,2}),\ldots,(e_{n,1},e_{n,2})}$. □

8 Classifying Digits with Tropical Coordinates

Adcock et al. [2] used polynomial coordinates to classify digits from the MNIST database [21] of handwritten digits. In this section we compare classification results they obtained with mine, which were classified using tropical coordinates. Aaron Adcock provided the matlab code needed to convert digital images into filtrations.

While homology itself cannot distinguish between the digits - 1, 5, and 7 never have loops, 0, 6, 9 always have loops, 8 has two loops, while 2, 3, 4 might or might not have loops, depending on style - we can use persistent homology as a measurement of shape. Figure 1 shows the first 100 digits of the database. The original black and white images



Figure 1: The first 100 images of the MNIST database.

were first normalized, scaled into a 20×20 pixel bounding box and anti-aliased, which introduced grayscale levels. Pixel values are 0 to 255, where 0 means background (white), 255 means foreground (black).

Following Collins et al. [12], we first threshold (setting pixel values greater than 100 to 1 and the rest to 0) to produce a binary image. We construct four filtrations as follows. For each pixel we add a vertex, for any pair of adjacent pixels (diagonals included) an edge and for any triple of adjacent pixels a 2-simplex. We sweep across the rows from the left and the right and across the columns from top to bottom and vice versa. This adds spatial information into what would otherwise be a purely topological measurement. We take both Betti 0 and Betti 1.

This extra spatial information reveals the location of various topological features. For example, though a '9' and '6' both have one connected component and one loop, the loop will appear at different locations in the 1-dimensional homology top-down sweep for the '9' and '6' (see Figure 3). In digits with no loops 0-dimensional homology right to left sweep distinguishes '3' from other digits (see Figure 2).


Digit 0 Up Sweep: Dimension 1
Digit 2 Up Sweep: Dimension 1
Digit 6 Up Sweep: Dimension 1
Digit 8 Up Sweep: Dimension 1
Digit 9 Up Sweep: Dimension 1

Figure 2: 1-dimensional homology bottom to top sweep for '0', '2', '6', '8' and '9'.

We can use different methods for turning barcodes into vectors. Adcock et al. selected four features,

$$\sum_i x_i(y_i - x_i)$$
$$\sum_i (y_{\max} - y_i)(y_i - x_i)$$
$$\sum_i x_i^2(y_i - x_i)^4$$
$$\sum_i (y_{\max} - y_i)^2(y_i - x_i)^4$$


Digit 1 Right Sweep: Dimension 0
Digit 3 Right Sweep: Dimension 0
Digit 4 Right Sweep: Dimension 0
Digit 5 Right Sweep: Dimension 0
Digit 7 Right Sweep: Dimension 0

Figure 3: 0-dimensional homology right to left sweep for '1', '3', '4', '5' and '7'.

which when applied to the four sweeps, each with a 0-dimensional and 1- dimensional barcode, gives a feature vector of total size 32. We used command `fitcecoc` in matlab to get an error-correcting output codes (ECOC) multiclass model. This model was trained using support vector machine (SVM). We obtained the best results using the Gaussian kernel. As is typical when using a SVM, we scaled each coordinate such that the values were between 0 and 1. To measure the classification accuracy we used 100-fold cross-validation. See Table 1 for results.

1000 digits	5000 digits	10000 digits
87.5%	90.04%	91.04%

Table 1: Classification accuracy using ordinary polynomial coordinates.

Using the following max-plus type coordinates

$\max_i d_i$
$\max_{i<j} (d_i + d_j)$
$\max_{i<j<k} (d_i + d_j + d_k)$
$\max_{i<j<k<l} (d_i + d_j + d_k + d_l)$
$\sum_i d_i$
$\sum_i \min(28d_i, x_i)$
$\sum_i (\max_i(\min(28d_i, x_i) + d_i) - (\min(28d_i, x_i) + d_i))$

yields slightly better results (see Table 2). Note that we used many functions involving sums of lengths of intervals. These yielded the best results, which is perhaps not surprising since when using persistent homology and interpreting the barcode, we assign importance to features depending on over what range of parameters they persist.

1000 digits	5000 digits	10000 digits
87.70%	91.36%	92.41%

Table 2: Classification accuracy using max-plus type coordinates.

This method just demonstrates how one can use persistent homology with other machine learning algorithms and does not outperform existing classification algorithms. Figure 4 shows examples of digits that were not correctly The most common confusion is between

Figure 4: Common Misclassifications.

a '5' and a '2' written with no loop. Other common confusions occur when topological changes occurred to the digit, for example when '8' is written with no loops, etc.

These examples also show the power of combining topology with geometry, and in particular demonstrate how coordinates can serve as a method for organizing the collection of all barcodes, and therefore any database whose members produce barcodes. They are also stable with respect to the bottleneck and Wasserstein distances.

Acknowledgement

The author thanks Gunnar Carlsson, Gregory Brumfiel and Davorin Lešnik for helpful discussions.

References

[1] D. Rubin A. Aadcock and G. Carlsson. "Classification of Hepatic Lesions using the Matching Metric". In: *Computer Vision and Image Understanding* 121 (2014), pp. 36–42.

[2] A. Aadcock, E. Carlsson, and G. Carlsson. "The Ring of Algebraic Functions on Persistence Bar Codes". In: *Homology, Homotopy and Applications* (to appear).

[3] Henry Adams and Gunnar Carlsson. "Evasion paths in mobile sensor networks". In: *The International Journal of Robotics Research* 34 (2014), pp. 90–104.

[4] Peter Bubenik. "Statistical Topological Data Analysis Using Persistence Landscapes". In: *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 16.1 (2015), pp. 77–102.

[5] G. Carlsson. "Topological pattern recognition for point cloud data". In: *Acta Numerica* 23 (2013), pp. 289–368.

[6] G. Carlsson. "Topology and Data". In: *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 46 (2009), pp. 255–308.

[7] Gunnar Carlsson and Afra J. Zomorodian. "Computing persistent homology". In: *Discrete and Computational Geometry* 33 (2005), pp. 249–274.

[8] Mathieu Carrière, Steve Y. Oudot, and Maks Ovsjanikov. "Stable Topological Signatures for Points on 3D Shapes". In: *Proceedings of the Eurographics Symposium on Geometry Processing*. SGP '15. Graz, Austria: Eurographics Association, 2015, pp. 1–12. DOI: 10.1111/cgf.12692. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cgf.12692.

[9] Sofya Chepushtanova et al. "Persistence Images: An Alternative Persistent Homology Representation". 2015.

[10] Moo K. Chung, Peter Bubenik, and Peter T. Kim. "Information Processing in Medical Imaging: 21st International Conference, IPMI 2009, Williamsburg, VA, USA, July 5-10, 2009. Proceedings". In: 2009. Chap. Persistence Diagrams of Cortical Surface Data, pp. 386–397.

[11] David Cohen-Steiner, Herbert Edelsbrunner, and John Harer. "Stability of Persistence Diagrams". In: *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 37.1 (2007), pp. 103–120.

[12] Anne Collins et al. "A Barcode Shape Descriptor for Curve Point Cloud Data". In: *Proceedings of the First Eurographics Conference on Point-Based Graphics*. SPBG'04. 2004, pp. 181–191.

[13] Carina Curto et al. "The Neural Ring: An Algebraic Tool for Analyzing the Intrinsic Structure of Neural Codes". In: *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* 75.9 (2013), pp. 1571–1611.

[14] Herbert Edelsbrunner, David Letscher, and Afra J. Zomorodian. "Topological persistence and simplification". In: *Discrete and Computational Geometry* 28 (2002), pp. 511–533.

[15] B. Di Fabio and M. Ferri. "Comparing persistence diagrams through complex vectors". 2015.

[16] M. Ferri and C. Landi. "Representing size functions by complex polynomials". In: *Proc. Math. Met. in Pattern Recognition* 9 (1999), pp. 16–19.

[17] Massimo Ferri and Ignazio Stanganelli. "Size Functions for the Morphological Analysis of Melanocytic Lesions". In: *International Journal of Biomedical Imaging* 2010 (2010).

[18] P. Frosini and C. Landi. *Size Theory as a Topological Tool for Computer Vision*. Tech. rep.

[19] Robert Ghrist and Vin de Silva. "Coordinate-free Coverage in Sensor Networks with Controlled Boundaries via Homology". In: *International Journal of Robotics Research* 25 (2006), pp. 1205–1222.

[20] Chad Giusti et al. “Clique topology reveals intrinsic geometric structure in neural correlations”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112.44 (2015).

[21] Y. LeCun and C. Cortes. “The MNIST Database”. http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/. 2015.

[22] Jose A. Perea and Gunnar Carlsson. “A Klein-Bottle-Based Dictionary for Texture Representation”. In: *International Journal of Computer Vision* 1 (2014), pp. 75–97.

[23] Jan Reininghaus et al. “A Stable Multi-Scale Kernel for Topological Machine Learning”. In: *The IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2015.

[24] Gurjeet Singh, Facundo Mémoli, and Gunnar Carlsson. “Topological Methods for the Analysis of High Dimensional Data Sets and 3D Object Recognition”. In: *Eurographics Symposium on Point Based Graphics, European Association for Computer Graphics* (2007).

[25] S. Kališnik Verovšek and G. Carlsson. “Symmetric and r-Symmetric Tropical Polynomials and Rational Functions”. 2014.